

Mehmood has not paid the filing fee for this action, and he has not filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

However, the court has examined Mehmood's petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and finds that the petition is plainly frivolous; it obviously does not state a claim upon which habeas relief could be granted by this court. Therefore, the court will summarily dismiss this action.

As far as the court can tell, in his habeas petition in this case, Mehmood complains that he does not receive an adequate diet appropriate to his Muslim religious faith.

Mehmood's claims are not cognizable in this habeas corpus action. "[T]he essence of habeas corpus is an attack by a person in custody upon the legality of that custody, and ... the traditional function of the writ is to secure release from illegal custody." *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 484 (1973); *see also Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 481 (1984) ("[H]abeas corpus is the exclusive remedy for a state prisoner who challenges the fact or duration of his confinement and seeks immediate or speedier release...."); *Ramirez v. Galaza*, 334 F.3d 850, 859 (9th Cir.2003) ("[H]abeas jurisdiction is absent, and a § 1983 action proper, where a successful challenge to a prison condition will not necessarily shorten the prisoner's sentence."); *Badea v. Cox*, 931 F.2d 573, 574 (9th Cir.1991) ("Habeas corpus proceedings are the proper mechanism for a prisoner to challenge the 'legality or duration' of confinement. A civil rights action, in contrast, is the proper method of challenging 'conditions of ... confinement." (citations omitted)). Mehmood appears to challenge the conditions of his confinement. He must do so in a civil rights action. His claims are not cognizable in this habeas corpus action.

The court notes that in his complaint in Case No. 2:15-cv-01369-RCJ-CWH, one of the civil rights actions that Mehmood has initiated in this court, Mehmood asserts claims that he does not receive an adequate diet appropriate to his Muslim religious faith.

The court will summarily dismiss this action pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts.

1	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED.
2	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner is denied a certificate of appealability.
3	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment accordingly.
4	
5	Dated this 13 th day of October, 2015.
6	
7	Get a second and a second a se
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	